

1 ROBERT A. SIEGEL (S.B. #64604)
2 rsiegel@omm.com
3 O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP
400 South Hope Street, 18th Floor
3 Los Angeles, CA 90071-2899
Telephone: 213-430-6000
4 Facsimile: 213-430-6407

5 ADAM P. KOHSWEENEY (S.B. #229983)
6 akohsweeney@omm.com
7 SUSANNAH K. HOWARD (S.B. #291326)
showard@omm.com
8 KRISTIN M. MACDONNELL (S.B. #307124)
kmacdonnell@omm.com
9 O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP
Two Embarcadero Center
San Francisco, CA 94111-3823
Telephone: 415-984-8912
10 Facsimile: 415-984-8701

11 Attorneys for Defendant
12 American Airlines, Inc.

13
14
15 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
16 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
17 **SAN JOSE DIVISION**
18

19 HASIM A. MOHAMMED, on behalf of
himself, all others similarly situated

20 Plaintiff,

21 v.

22 AMERICAN AIRLINES, INC., a
Corporation; and DOES 1 through 50,
23 inclusive,

24 Defendants.

25 Case No. CV _____

**NOTICE OF REMOVAL OF DEFENDANT
AMERICAN AIRLINES, INC.**

(28 U.S.C. §§ 1332(d), 1441(a))

(Santa Clara County Superior Court Case No.
19CV342788)

26

27

28

1 **TO THE HONORABLE JUDGES OF THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR**
 2 **THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA AND TO PLAINTIFF HASIM A.**
 3 **MOHAMMED AND PLAINTIFF'S ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:**

4 Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1332(d), 1441(1) and 1446, Defendant American Airlines, Inc.
 5 ("American") hereby files this Notice of Removal, removing this action brought by Plaintiff
 6 Hasim A. Mohammed ("Plaintiff") from the Superior Court of the State of California, County of
 7 Santa Clara, where the action is currently pending, to this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d),
 8 as amended by the Class Action Fairness Act of 2005. American states the following grounds for
 9 removal:

10 **PROCEDURAL HISTORY AND TIMELINESS OF REMOVAL**

11 1. On February 21, 2019, American received a Summons and Complaint that had
 12 been filed on February 19, 2019, a true and correct copy of which is attached hereto collectively
 13 as **Exhibit A**. The action was brought as a putative class action in the Superior Court of the State
 14 of California, County of Santa Clara, styled and captioned exactly as above, and assigned Case
 15 No. 19CV342788. On March 22, 2019, American filed an Answer to the Complaint in the
 16 Superior Court of the State of California, County of Santa Clara, a copy of which is attached
 17 hereto as **Exhibit B**. No other process, pleadings or orders have been filed and served in this
 18 action, and no other defendant has been named or served.

19 2. The Complaint asserts six causes of action, predicated on alleged violations of
 20 California's meal and rest break, recordkeeping, and timeliness of wage payment laws. Plaintiff
 21 seeks to bring these claims on behalf of a putative "Hourly Employee Class" defined as "[a]ll
 22 persons employed by Defendants and/or any staffing agencies and/or any other third parties in
 23 hourly or non-exempt positions in California during the Relevant Time Period." (Ex. A ¶ 11).¹

26 ¹ The "Relevant Time Period" is alleged to be from February 19, 2015, to the date of final
 27 judgment. (Ex. A ¶ 11.) Plaintiff also seeks to certify various subclasses, including a Meal
 28 Period Subclass, a Rest Period Subclass, a Wage Statement Penalties Subclass, a Waiting Time
 Penalties Subclass. (*Id.*).

1 Additionally, Plaintiff seeks to certify a “UCL Class” defined as “[a]ll Hourly Employee Class
 2 members employed by Defendants in California during the Relevant Time Period.” (*Id.*)

3 3. In the First Cause of Action, Plaintiff alleges that American failed to provide
 4 Plaintiff and the putative class members off-duty meal periods in accordance with the California
 5 Labor Code and the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission (“IWC”) Wage Order. (Ex. A ¶¶
 6 32-33, 38-39.) Plaintiff seeks premium compensation for missed meal periods pursuant to Labor
 7 Code § 226.7, interests, costs, and attorneys’ fees. (*Id.* ¶¶ 44-45.)

8 4. In the Second Cause of Action, Plaintiff alleges that American failed to provide
 9 Plaintiff and the putative class members off-duty rest periods in accordance with the California
 10 Labor Code and applicable IWC Wage Order. (Ex. A ¶ 52.) Plaintiff seeks premium
 11 compensation for missed rest period pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7, interest, costs, and
 12 attorneys’ fees. (*Id.* ¶¶ 55-56.)

13 5. In the Third Cause of Action, Plaintiff alleges that American failed to pay Plaintiff
 14 and the putative class members regular and overtime wages in accordance with California Labor
 15 Code §§ 223, 510, 1196, 1197, and 1198. (Ex. A ¶ 71.) Plaintiff seeks recovery of all unpaid
 16 straight time and overtime wages, interest, statutory costs, and statutory penalties. (*Id.* ¶¶ 78-79.)

17 6. In the Fourth Cause of Action, Plaintiff alleges that American failed to provide
 18 accurate itemized wage statements to Plaintiff and the putative class members. (Ex. A ¶ 83.)
 19 Plaintiff seeks penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 226, attorneys’ fees, and costs. (*Id.* ¶ 86.)

20 7. In the Fifth Cause of Action, Plaintiff alleges that American failed to timely pay all
 21 final wages in accordance with California Labor Code §§ 201-203. (Ex. A ¶ 94.) Plaintiff seeks
 22 penalties pursuant to Labor Code §§ 203 and 218.6, as well as attorneys’ fees and costs. (*Id.* ¶¶
 23 96, 97.)

24 8. In the Sixth Cause of Action, Plaintiff alleges that American engaged in unfair
 25 business practices by engaging in the alleged violations described in the first through fourth
 26 causes of action. (Ex. A ¶ 108.) Plaintiff seeks declaratory relief and restitution of all money
 27 acquired by American as a result of these allegedly unfair practices according to California
 28 Business & Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.*, as well as attorneys’ fees. (*Id.* ¶ 114-115.)

1 9. This Notice of Removal has been filed within thirty (30) days of service of
 2 American, and, as no other defendant has been named or served, the requirement of 28 U.S.C.
 3 § 1446(b) requiring removal within thirty (30) days of service of the first defendant has been
 4 satisfied. Therefore, this Notice of Removal has been timely filed.

5 **BASIS FOR REMOVAL: CLASS ACTION FAIRNESS ACT OF 2005 (“CAFA”)**

6 10. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d), which
 7 provides that the United States District Courts have original jurisdiction over any class action: (i)
 8 involving a plaintiff class of 100 or more members, (ii) where at least one member of the plaintiff
 9 class is a citizen of a State different from any defendant, and (iii) in which the matter in
 10 controversy exceeds (in the aggregate) the sum or value of \$5,000,000, exclusive of interest and
 11 costs. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d)(2)(A) & (5)(B); *see also Dart Cherokee Basin Operating Co. v.*
 12 *Owens*, 135 S. Ct. 547, 554 (2014) (explaining that “CAFA’s provisions should be read broadly,
 13 with a strong preference that interstate class actions should be heard in federal court if properly
 14 removed by any defendant.” (internal quotation marks omitted)).²

15 11. These three conditions are satisfied here. First, Plaintiff filed this action as a
 16 “class action” within the meaning of 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d)(1)(b) because Plaintiff pleads that this
 17 civil action should be considered a class action under California law. (Ex. A ¶ 11.) According to
 18 American’s records, there are approximately 1,379 ramp agents currently working for American
 19 in California. (Declaration of Lisa Magdaleno i/s/o Notice of Removal, dated March 25, 2019
 20 (“Magdaleno Decl.”) ¶ 2.) The requirement that the class consist of at least 100 members is
 21 therefore satisfied.

22 12. Second, Plaintiff is a citizen of the state of California. (Ex. A ¶ 5.) American is
 23 incorporated in the State of Delaware, with its principal place of business in Fort Worth Texas,
 24 and is therefore for removal purposes a citizen of the State of Delaware and of the State of Texas.
 25

26
 27 2 American does not waive, and expressly reserves, all arguments that this matter is improper for
 28 both class certification and as a non-class representative action.

1 See *Hertz Corp. v. Friend*, 559 U.S. 77, 92-93 (2010); Magdaleno Decl. ¶ 4. Thus, Plaintiff is a
 2 citizen of a state different from American within the meaning of 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d)(2)(A).

3 13. Third, the claims asserted by the plaintiff class, aggregated as required by 28
 4 U.S.C. § 1332(d)(2), exceed the necessary sum of \$5,000,000 “in controversy” within the
 5 meaning of 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d)(2). Although American denies that Plaintiff and/or any putative
 6 class member is entitled to any relief based on the allegations in the Complaint, given the size of
 7 the proposed class, the breadth of the claims alleged and relief sought, and the specific allegations
 8 in the Complaint, the amount put “in controversy” by this litigation is in excess of \$10,000,000,
 9 far exceeding the threshold requirement of \$5,000,000:

- 10 a. Plaintiff’s First and Second Causes of Action allege that American
 maintained a policy or practice of denying Plaintiff and the putative class
 members off-duty meal and rest periods or premium compensation in lieu
 thereof, Compl. ¶¶ 38-41; 52-53, and therefore he and the putative class
 members are entitled to missed meal and rest period premiums pursuant to
 Labor Code § 226.7 going back four years to February 19, 2015.
- 11 b. There are approximately 1,379 individuals currently working for
 American as ramp agents in California. (Magdaleno Decl. ¶ 2.) According
 to the applicable collective bargaining agreement, the current lowest hourly
 rate for ramp agents is \$14.18 per hour. (*Id.* ¶ 3.) Labor Code § 226.7
 provides that if an employer fails to provide a meal or rest period in
 accordance with the law, “the employer shall pay the employee one
 additional hour of pay at the employee’s regular rate of compensation for
 each workday that the meal or rest or recovery period is not provided.”
 Cal. Lab. Code § 226.7(c).
- 12 c. Reducing the number of putative class members by approximately 30%
 (965) to account for attrition, and assuming each class member was paid at
 \$14.18 per hour and missed one meal and one rest break each week for the

28

4 years (or 208 weeks) at issue in this action, the amount in controversy for Plaintiff's First and Second Causes of Action is approximately:

i. $(14.18 \times 208 \text{ weeks} \times 965) + (14.18 \times 208 \text{ weeks} \times 965) =$
\$5,692,419.20.

d. Although American contends that the claims are meritless, and that no monies are owed, relative to the claims in the Complaint, this calculation uses low assumptions regarding the putative class members' regular hourly rate and the number of missed meal and rest periods per week.

9 14. This calculation only values the First and Second Causes of Action and only
10 considers ramp agents—accordingly, the actual amount in controversy is significantly higher.

11 15. In addition, Plaintiff seeks to recover attorney’s fees, which further increases the
12 alleged amount “in controversy” beyond \$5,000,000. (Ex. A ¶¶ 45, 56, 79, 86, 97, 115.); *see*
13 *Lowdermilk v. U.S. Bank Nat’l Ass’n*, 479 F.3d 994 (9th Cir. 2007) (including attorneys’ fees in
14 calculating amount in controversy), *overruled on other grounds by Standard Fire Ins. Co. v.*
15 *Knowles*, 133 S. Ct. 1345 (2013); *see also Gibson v. Chrysler Corp.*, 261 F.3d 927 (9th Cir. 2001)
16 (holding that attorneys’ fees were properly included in the amount in controversy requirement in
17 a class action); *Galt G/S v. JSS Scandinavia*, 142 F.3d 1150 (9th Cir. 1998) (including attorneys’
18 fees in calculating the amount in controversy requirement for traditional diversity jurisdiction).

16. Thus, based on the reasonable assumptions set forth herein, the potential
compensatory damages, together with the statutory penalties and attorney's fees, exceed the
\$5,000,000 aggregate amount in controversy requirement set forth under 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d)(2).
Dart Cherokee, 135 S.Ct. at 554 (“a defendant's notice of removal need include only a plausible
allegation that the amount in controversy exceeds the jurisdictional threshold.”).

VENUE

25 17. Plaintiff's state court action was commenced in the Superior Court of the State of
26 California for the County of Santa Clara and, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 84(a), 1441(a), & 1446(a)
27 may be removed to this United States District Court for the Northern District of California, which
28 embraces Santa Clara County within its jurisdiction.

CONCLUSION

18. For the reasons discussed herein, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1332(d), 1441(a) & 1446, this state court action may be removed to this Federal District Court.

WHEREFORE, Defendant requests that this action be brought to this Court, and that this Court exercise its jurisdiction in the premises.

Dated: March 25, 2019

O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP
ROBERT A. SIEGEL
ADAM P. KOHSEWEENEY
SUSANNAH K. HOWARD

By: /s/ Adam P. KohSweeney

Adam P. KohSweeney
Attorneys for Defendant American Airlines,
Inc.